

Message

From: Washington, John [/o=ExchangeLabs/ou=Exchange Administrative Group (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=fdc3e8ce9f1d45c4894881ff420ca104-Washington, John]
Sent: 3/19/2020 2:15:47 PM
To: Jake Yeston [jyeston@aaas.org]
Subject: Re: Update and question as to your preference
Attachments: 3 200319 WashingtonResubmissionLetter.docx; 3 200319 WashingtonResubmissionLetter+ResponseToReviewers.docx

Hi Jake,

I am attaching a revised letter in two forms: i) a letter to the editor that includes a two-paragraph description of our changes due to Tonelli et al.; and ii) a letter to the editor *and responses to reviewers* that includes a two-paragraph description of our changes due to Tonelli et al.

Please let me know if my description in these letters of our Tonelli modifications needs any improvement.

I think one of these will fit the bill on what you wanted, but if not please just let me know.

Thanks again!
John

From: Jake Yeston <jyeston@aaas.org>
Sent: Wednesday, March 18, 2020 1:12 PM
To: Washington, John <Washington.John@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Update and question as to your preference

Hi John,

Thanks for sending in the revision. Would it be possible to send me a new version of the response letter to reviewers that clarifies in more detail at the beginning how your analysis changed in light of having found the J. Fluorine Chem. papers from Solvay? It would be easier to include that all in a single document. You can email it to me directly. I'd like to go back to at least one or two reviewers here before proceeding, but I'll try to get feedback quickly.

Thanks very much,

Jake

From: Washington, John <Washington.John@epa.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, March 04, 2020 3:36 PM
To: Jake Yeston <jyeston@aaas.org>
Subject: RE: Update and question as to your preference

Hi Jake,

Heartbreak, but I understand.

Thanks,
John

From: Jake Yeston <jyeston@aaas.org>
Sent: Wednesday, March 4, 2020 3:32 PM
To: Washington, John <Washington.John@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Update and question as to your preference

Hi John,

Thanks for the email. This Solvay paper seems to be fairly significant in the context of the claim that they didn't disclose the structures you uncovered. Have you looked carefully through the follow-up paper as well?

<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0022113911000698>

I think for that reason, it would be much clearer to go back to the reviewers with all the proper structures depicted in the figures. There's really no great hurry on our end.

regards,

Jake

From: Washington, John <Washington.John@epa.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, March 4, 2020 3:13 PM
To: Jake Yeston <jyeston@aaas.org>
Subject: Update and question as to your preference

Hi Jake,

I have addressed all your comments, save two. Specifically I have work to do on two figures (upon which you commented), Figure 1 of the generic molecule and Figure 2/S2 of the c'grams and mass spectra which have numerous molecular structures.

One of our co-authors found a CIPFPECA molecular-synthesis paper with more structural information than is available in our exhaustive mass-spectra efforts or the two literature sources we reference for structure (Zhanyun Wang et al. and EFSA). I am attaching this newly discovered paper. Based on this paper, we think the Cl(CF₂)O- moiety has a slightly different structure than shown in our draft and different than shown in our literature references.

In an effort to be accurate on Figs 1, 2 and S2, I have to work with our graphics expert, who has no chemistry expertise, by email/phone – a painstaking process. Optimistically, I estimate that he might be done reworking the figures next week.

So what is your preference:

1. Wait until the figures are complete and resubmit at that time even though otherwise I am done editing;
2. Resubmit the draft to you informally now via email, along with all my annotated responses to your comments;
or
3. Resubmit now thru the Science portal, with a few-sentence explanation that Figs 1, 2 and S2 will be coming soon?

In absence of instructions from you otherwise, my default will be option 1. I just did not want you to think I was procrastinating.

It has been mayhem here in EPA with this manuscript, NJDEP and the EPA Region 2 staff (NJ is in EPA Region 2). And the EPA people working on several similar facilities at other locations won't leave me alone either. So I very much appreciate you having been patient.

Thanks,

John

From: Jake Yeston <jveston@aaas.org>
Sent: Tuesday, March 3, 2020 3:46 PM
To: Washington, John <Washington.John@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: revised figure

You do want that C- (not O-) on the 3rd structure from the left? Just double-checking. I think it looks great too otherwise.

From: Washington, John <Washington.John@epa.gov>
Sent: 02 March 2020 21:53
To: Jake S. Yeston <science_editors@aaas.org>
Subject: FW: revised figure

Hi Jake,

Please let me know if the attached draft needs any further modification. I think it looks great.

John

From: Soderlind, Paul <Soderlind.Paul@epa.gov>
Sent: Monday, March 2, 2020 4:39 PM
To: Washington, John <Washington.John@epa.gov>
Subject: revised figure

John, Here is the file with the CF3 notation.